



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,397	12/21/2001	Patrick Zuili	SSL1P001/SS-010	3617

7590 09/19/2006
James S. Ferrell
CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,397	ZUILI, PATRICK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9 and 13-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-12, 16-22 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6,10-12,16-22, and 40 have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-6,10-12,16-22, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Medoff, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088517.

As per claims 1,16, and 40, the applicant describes a computer-implemented method for restricting use of a clipboard application in a multi-application computing environment, comprising the following limitations which are met by Medoff: a)

Art Unit: 2137

receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a source application ([0082]-[0087]); b) determining whether the source file is a secured file ([0082]-[0087]); c) preventing subsequent usage of the
5 designated content in a destination application via the clipboard application when said determining determines that the source file is a secured file ([0082]-[0087]).

As per claims 2-4, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claim 1, which is met by Medoff, with the
10 following limitation which is also met by Medoff: receiving a paste selection to provide the designated content to the destination application ([0082]-[0087]).

As per claims 5-6 and 21-22, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 1 and 20, which are met by
15 Medoff, with the following limitation which is also met by Medoff: wherein said determining operates to determine that the source file is a secured file based on security information provided by the source application ([0082]-[0087]).

As per claims 10,17, and 18, the applicant describes the
20 computer-implemented method of claims 1 and 16, which are met by Medoff, with the following limitation which is also met by Medoff: storing alternate content to the clipboard application in place of the designated content when said determining

Art Unit: 2137

determines that the source file is a secured file ([0082]-[0087])).

As per claims 11-12 and 19-20, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 10,16, and 17, which are
5 met by Medoff, with the following limitation which is also met by Medoff storing the designated content to the clipboard application when said determining determines that the source file is not a secured file ([0082]-[0087])).

10 4. Claims 1-6,10-12,16-22, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mast, U.S. Patent No. 5,881,287.

As per claims 1,16, and 40, the applicant describes a computer-implemented method for restricting use of a clipboard
15 application in a multi-application computing environment, comprising the following limitations which are met by Mast: a) receiving a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a source application (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-67); b) determining whether the
20 source file is a secured file (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-67); c) preventing subsequent usage of the designated content in a destination application via the clipboard application when

Art Unit: 2137

said determining determines that the source file is a secured file (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-67).

As per claims 2-4, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claim 1, which is met by Mast, with the following limitation which is also met by Mast: Receiving a paste selection to provide the designated content to the destination application (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-67).

As per claims 5-6 and 21-22, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 1 and 20, which are met by Mast, with the following limitation which is also met by Mast: Wherein said determining operates to determine that the source file is a secured file based on security information provided by the source application (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-67).

As per claims 10,17, and 18, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 1 and 16, which are met by Mast, with the following limitation which is also met by Mast: Storing alternate content to the clipboard application in place of the designated content when said determining determines that the source file is a secured file (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-67).

As per claims 11-12 and 19-20, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 10,16, and 17, which are

Art Unit: 2137

met by Mast, with the following limitation which is also met by Mast: Storing the designated content to the clipboard application when said determining determines that the source file is not a secured file (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 9, lines 22-
5 67).

5. Claims 1-6,10-12,16-22, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by SecurityOptions ("SecurityOptions". December 20, 2001. DC & Co. pages 1-2).

10 As per claims 1,16, and 40, the applicant describes a computer-implemented method for restricting use of a clipboard application in a multi-application computing environment, comprising the following limitations which are met by SecurityOptions: a) receiving a copy selection associated with
15 designated content of a source file being displayed by a source application (pages 1-2); b) determining whether the source file is a secured file (pages 1-2); c) preventing subsequent usage of the designated content in a destination application via the clipboard application when said determining determines that the
20 source file is a secured file (pages 1-2).

As per claims 2-4, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claim 1, which is met by SecurityOptions, with the following limitation which is also met by

Art Unit: 2137

SecurityOptions: Receiving a paste selection to provide the designated content to the destination application (pages 1-2).

As per claims 5-6 and 21-22, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 1 and 20, which are met by SecurityOptions, with the following limitation which is also met by SecurityOptions: Wherein said determining operates to determine that the source file is a secured file based on security information provided by the source application (pages 1-2).

As per claims 10,17, and 18, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 1 and 16, which are met by SecurityOptions, with the following limitation which is also met by SecurityOptions: Storing alternate content to the clipboard application in place of the designated content when said determining determines that the source file is a secured file (pages 1-2).

As per claims 11-12 and 19-20, the applicant describes the computer-implemented method of claims 10,16, and 17, which are met by SecurityOptions, with the following limitation which is also met by SecurityOptions: Storing the designated content to the clipboard application when said determining determines that the source file is not a secured file (pages 1-2).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 08/25/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: the election with traverse has not been responded to; the rejections
5 under 35 USC 101 were improper; Medoff fails to disclose "determining whether the source file is a secured file"; Mast fails to prevent any further usage of the content in a destination application via the clipboard; Mast fails to disclose a secured file because a secured file is a file or
10 document that has data that cannot be accessed without a priori knowledge; Mast does not teach the source file being displayed by a source application; SecurityOptions fails to disclose determining whether a source file is a secure file; and SecurityOptions fails to disclose a secured file because a
15 secured file is a file or document that has data that cannot be accessed without a priori knowledge.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the election with traverse has not been responded to, since the election was made with traverse but without any arguments for this traversal it
20 was and has been considered to be an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

With respect to Applicant's argument that the rejections under 35 USC 101 were improper, Applicant's arguments have been

Art Unit: 2137

considered and the rejections under 35 UCS 101 have been withdrawn.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Medoff fails to disclose "determining whether the source file is a secured
5 file", whenever a user attempts to use the keys or mouse to copy the secured document a determination has to be made to block that command by the system and issue a message to be displayed as illustrated by figure 8.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Mast fails to
10 prevent any further usage of the content in a destination application via the clipboard, Mast prevents the copying of protected images to the clipboard, therefore if the image can never be stored in the clipboard it is prevented from being used by any destination application via the clipboard.

15 With respect to Applicant's argument that Mast fails to disclose a secured file because a secured file is a file or document that has data that cannot be accessed without a priori knowledge this limitation is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the
20 specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2137

With respect to Applicant's argument that Mast does not teach the source file being displayed by a source application, this limitation is explicitly disclosed in column 9 lines 18-30 where Mast discloses, "the Windows Application has displayed the
5 unencrypted image files on the screen".

With respect to Applicant's argument that SecurityOptions fails to disclose determining whether a source file is a secure file whenever the CopyAndPaste value is changed from allow to disallow the file is considered secure and when one of the
10 conforming applications utilize the document it can determine the file is secured and prevent any copying and pasting of the document.

With respect to Applicant's argument that SecurityOptions fails to disclose a secured file because a secured file is a
15 file or document that has data that cannot be accessed without a priori knowledge this limitation is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d
20 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2137

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this
5 action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
10 extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Schreiber et al. and Krueger et al. disclose methods of preventing copying and pasting.

20 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner

Art Unit: 2137

can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be
5 reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval
10 (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on
15 access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER